

June 30, 2008

Minerals Program  
Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining  
1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801

RE: Sixth Review of Notice of Intention to Commence Large Mining Operations, Miracle Rock Mining and Research, The Rockland Mine, M0150040, Task 2195, Emery County, Utah

Miracle Rock Mining and Research, owner and operator of the Rockland Mine (permittee), hereby submits the deficiency responses to the sixth review of Notice of Intension to Commence Large Mining Operations.

A Notice of Intention to Commence Large Mining Operations for the Rockland Mine was submitted on August 15, 2006. The Division's review found deficiencies in this submittal. This deficiency document was received by Rockland Mine on or around November 13, 2006 and stated that the "Operator has an additional 60 days after submitting this response to ensure that it is approvable." The permittee submitted the plan on January 10, 2007. The review document dated March 12, 2007 instructed that the Permittee must submit an approval plan immediately. The permittee requested an extension to April 25, 2007 in which the Division granted.

The permittee again requested an additional 30 day extension to May 25, 2007 in order to retain outside consulting services to respond to the Division's deficiencies. Submittal was made on May 21, 2007 and contained a binder with a developed reclamation plan for the facility with associated maps and appendices. The Division's review this plan found it deficient to the minerals regulatory program. Deficiencies were received by the permittee on or about October 15, 2007.

On November 14, 2007, the permittee met with the Division to discuss their concerns with the deficiencies and to agree on a timeframe for the submittal of a consolidated permit. The permittee submitted deficiency responses and a complete mining and reclamation plan for Division review. This plan was submitted on January 15, 2008. Deficiencies were sent to the permittee on April 8, 2008.

Attached are the deficiency responses along with a surety bond estimate for the reclamation of the Rockland Mine. Once this bond estimate is approved, a surety bond will be provided to the Division for the amount estimated.

The required MR-REV form is included with this submittal. Redline/strikeout copies of all the amended sections are enclosed. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this Deficiency Response document, please contact me at 435-286-2222.

Sincerely,



David Taylor  
President

Enclosures      Deficiency Responses  
                         Amended Text Pages  
                         Rockland Mine Bond Estimate

Cc      Dennis Oakley

RECEIVED

JUL 02 2008

DIV. OF OIL, GAS & MINING

0002

This Deficiency Response document responds to the April 8, 2008 review of the Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining. The deficiencies are formatted in the R647-4 regulations and bolded while the responses are italicized.

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

1. **Page 5 of the plan says part of the subsoil is stored as a berm around the perimeter of the pad. Unless it is protected in some way, this is likely to be the first material used to backfill the highwall. Please show how this subsoil will be protected. (PBB)**

*Text changes in the Operation and the Reclamation Plans have been made to ensure this material is utilized properly. Refer to the highlighted text in these two sections included with this submittal.*

2. **The plan on page 6 says the vegetation cover standard would be 19.6 percent which means the premining vegetation cover is 28 percent. It appears from the vegetation survey that the premining cover value is 27 percent, and the minimum revegetation standard would be 18.9 percent. This is a minor change but adds clarity to the plan. (PBB)**

*The cover estimates in Appendix E include litter as one of the cover components and results in a standard of 19.6% . Using only the live cover component for estimating the standard computes to a revegetation requirement of 18.9%. Page 5 of the Operation Plan, and the spreadsheet in Appendix E, have been amended to state both the live vegetation cover standard and total cover estimate for the site.*

3. **Please include a copy of the storm water plan. (PBB)**

*This plan is included with this submittal as Appendix F.*

4. **Due the potential for extreme events, the Division needs designs or justification for the reclaimed ephemeral channel over regraded fill at the south end of the mine site. Please provide these designs. It would seem appropriate in this environment to not create a channel over fill. In a flash flood kind of storm, any channel would most likely be destroyed. A dissipation basin with large rocks might work better. Please provide designs for the 100 year storm for the existing channel or provide other suggestions. What is the drainage area that contributes to this channel? (TM)**